Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claim 9 was objected to because of an informality.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,587,680 issued to Ala-Laurila et al. on July 1, 2003.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,418,130 issued to Cheng et al. on July 9, 2002.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,370,380 issued to Norefors et al. on April 9, 2002.

Claims 4, 6, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila et al. in view of Cheng et al.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,241,598 issued to Raith on August 31, 1993.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Objection to Claim 9

Claim 9 was objected to because of an informality. The language and punctuation of the second limitation has been amended to clarify the limitation.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,587,680 issued to Ala-Laurila et al. on July 1, 2003.

Applicants note that the security information transferred in claim 1, as currently amended, is security information that was originally supplied by a central security node and was not used by the first base station. This is very different from Ala-Laurila et al., in which security information that was used by the first base station is transferred to the second base station. It is also very different from the token developed in Cheng et al., in which the information that is transferred is locally generated by the first base station. Advantageously, applicants' invention requires and achieves a full reauthentication for each handoff, without requiring each the base station to which the mobile terminal is moving to obtain fresh information from the central security node at the time of the handoff, which would otherwise be required. By contrast, the information transferred in Ala-Laurila et al. and the tokens of Cheng et al. are based on the same, already-used information from the central security node, so long as a network boundary is not crossed.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Ala-Laurila et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Therefore, so too are claims 3, 5, and 7-8, which depend from claim 1 and include all the limitations thereof.

Regarding claim 9, notwithstanding the Office Action's assertion to the contrary, there is no teaching or suggestion in Ala-Laurila et al. that the wireless terminal receives after its handoff request a response that indicates that the second base station can engage in an expedited handoff with the first base station.

This is because, firstly, the system of Ala-Laurila et al. only teaches to transmit the available access point list, i.e., the list of base stations available for a handoff, at selected time intervals or when the mobile terminal is initially activated. There is no

suggestion that the list is transmitted upon request for a handoff, which might be too late because of the risk of dropping the call at that point.

Secondly, the list does not indicate which, if any, of the base stations on the list can engage in an expedited handoff with the current base station. If one assumes that in Ala-Laurila et al. all base stations in the network, and hence any on the list, can engage in expedited handoffs, transmitting the list could not be considered a specific response that this base station can engage in expedited handoffs.

Thus, claim 9 is allowable over Ala-Laurila et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Therefore, so too are claims 12, and 15-16, which depend from claim 9 and include all the limitations thereof.

Ala-Laurila et al. does not anticipate or suggest applicants' claim 9.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,418,130 issued to Cheng et al. on July 9, 2002.

The Office Action seems to not have fully appreciated the term "knows" as used in claims 21 and 22 (and perhaps in claim 9 as well). The term "knows" is defined in the specification as originally filed. See, for example, page 8, lines 28-35, which are repeated hereinbelow for convenience.

> Next, conditional branch point 207 tests to determine if the first base station "knows" the second base station, i.e., the first base station has the second base station listed in its "map" information, such a listing having been the result of a previous handoff of a wireless terminal between the first and second base stations. More specifically, as part of the listing in the map information, the first base station may know a) the base station identification of the second base station, b) the network address of the second base station, e.g., its IP address, and c) security information, such as the public key of the second base station, which is used to secure communication between the first and second base stations, in accordance with an aspect of the invention.

Clearly then, this concept of "knows" has nothing to do with "administrative domains", which are referred to by the sections pointed at by the Office Action. In fact, as pointed out in applicants' specficiation's background and summary sections, each base station may even be considered its own domain within its own network boundaries.

Doing so requires authentication at each handoff. However base stations performing handoffs may be known to each other, or not, depending on the mapping process regardless of the fact that they are in different domains.

Clearly then, Cheng et al. does not teach applicants invention as recited in claims 21-22, in which expedited handoffs are performed when the second base station knows the first base station and nonexpedited handoffs are performed when the second base station does not know the first base station.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,370,380 issued to Norefors et al. on April 9, 2002. Claim 4, 6, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila et al. in view of Cheng et al.

The rejection of claims 2, 4, and 6 are predicated on the rejection of claim 1 over Ala-Laurila et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) of claim 1. Since that ground of rejection has been overcome, as explained hereinabove, and the additional cited references have not been shown to add the elements missing from Ala-Laurila et al. to anticipate or make obvious claim 1, the rejections of claims 2, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) cannot stand.

Similarly, the rejection of claim 13 cannot stand, because independent claim 9 from which it depends is allowable over Ala-Laurila et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and Cheng et al. has not been shown to add the elements missing from Ala-Laurila et al. to anticipate or make obvious claim 9.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,241,598 issued to Raith on August 31, 1993.

Neither Cheng et al. nor Raith teach or suggest the concept of a first base station knowing a second base station, as "knowing" is defined in applicants' specification, and therefore being unable to perform expedited handoff when the second base station is not nnown. Therefore, Neither Cheng et al. nor Raith, alone or in combination, can make obvious applicants' claims 17-20, which are, therefore, allowable 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.**

Respectfully,

S. Davies
M. Vanderveen

By _____
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: MARCH 12, 2004